

S.N. 10/065,018

125397

REMARKS

The Office action dated March 5, 2004 and the cited references have been carefully considered.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-53 are pending. Claims 1-20, 36-39, and 50-53 are withdrawn pursuant to an election made by the Applicants' attorney on January 8, 2004. Therefore, claims 21-35 and 40-48 remain in the current prosecution. The Applicants hereby affirm the election to prosecute claims 21-35 and 40-48 currently.

Claim 49 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 49 has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, claim 49 is now in condition for allowance. Early allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 21-25, 40, 41, and 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Graff et al. (U.S. Patent 6,522,067; hereinafter "Graff").

Claims 26, 42, 43, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graff in view of Baldo et al. (U.S. Patent 6,097,147; hereinafter "Baldo"). Claims 27, 28, 32, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graff in view of Wolk et al. (U.S. Patent 6,291,116; hereinafter "Wolk"). Claims 29-31 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graff in view of Collins, III et al. (U.S. Patent 6,642,652; hereinafter "Collins"). Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graff in view of Baldo, and further in view of Wolk. Claim 35 is are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graff in view of Baldo, and further in view of Wolk and Collins. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons set forth below.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102()

S.N. 10/065,018

125397

Claims 21-25, 40, 41, and 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Graff. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because Graff does not disclose each and every element of each of claims 21-25, 40, 41, and 45-47.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a *single* prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (emphasis added). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). "[T]he [Examiner] must identify the elements of the claims, determine their meaning in light of the specification and prosecution history, and identify corresponding elements disclosed in the allegedly anticipating reference." *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH*, 221 U.S.P.Q. 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

Graff discloses a barrier stack that consists of a plurality of separate layers, at least one of which is made of an inorganic material, and at least another one of which is made of an organic polymer. See; e.g., column 1, lines 60-61, 65-66; column 2, lines 7-18, 27-33. See also Figures 1-3. Each one of Graff's barrier layer or polymer layer is made of a distinct material from the next layer, and a distinct interface separates the adjacent barrier layer and polymer layer. That Graff's layers are materially distinct and a clear demarcation exists between adjacent layers is evidenced by Graff's method of making each stack. Each layer is sequentially and subsequently formed on a previous layer. See; e.g., column 5, lines 60-64; column 6, lines 35-37. The distinct layers are further evidenced by Graff's characterization of his stack as a set of layers of polymer/barrier/polymer. Column 5, lines 6-7. Furthermore, Graff consistently uses the term "stack" to characterize his structure. A term used in a patent bear a heavy presumption that it means what it says and has the ordinary meaning that would be attributed to that word by persons skilled in the relevant art. *Texas Digital Systems, Inc. v. Telegenix, Inc.*, 308 F.3d 1193, 1201 (Fed. Cir. 2002). The ordinary meaning of a stack is an orderly pile, a large quantity of number (Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, 1979). Thus, Graff's stack consists of a large number of orderly arranged distinct layers. Nowhere in Graff's disclosure does he mean otherwise.

In contradistinction, each of claims 21-25, 40, 41, and 45-47 recites a graded-composition coating, a composition of which varies substantially continuously across its

S.N. 10/065,018

125397

thickness. Thus, the coating of claims 21-25, 40, 41, and 45-47 does not have distinct layers separated by distinct interfaces.

Since Graff does not disclose each and every element of each of claims 21-25, 40, 41, and 45-47, Graff does not anticipate these claims.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 26, 42, 43, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graff in view of Baldo. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because a combination of Graff and Baldo does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 26, 42, 43, and 48.

"To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." M.P.E.P. § 2143.03, p. 2100-128 (8th ed., Rev. 1, Feb. 2003).

As pointed out above, Graff does not teach or suggest a coating, a composition of which varies substantially continuously across its thickness, as is recited in each of claims 26, 42, 43, and 48. Adding Baldo to show a reflective metal layer still does not provide all of the elements of each of claims 26, 42, 43, and 48.

Since a combination of Graff and Baldo does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of each of claims 26, 42, 43, and 48, these claims are patentable over Graff in view of Baldo under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 27, 28, 32, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graff in view of Wolk.

As pointed out above, Graff does not teach or suggest a coating, a composition of which varies substantially continuously across its thickness, as is recited in each of claims 27, 28, 32, and 33. Adding Wolk to show an organic layer of poly(N-vinylcarbazole) still does not provide all of the elements of each of claims 27, 28, 32, and 33. Furthermore, the Applicants respectfully point out that Wolk's poly(N-vinylcarbazole) functions as a hole transporting material, which is not the same function as in the Applicants' device.

S.N. 10/065,018

125397

Since a combination of Graff and Wolk does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of each of claims 27, 28, 32, and 33, these claims are patentable over Graff in view of Wolk under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 29-31 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graff in view of Collins.

As pointed out above, Graff does not teach or suggest a coating, a composition of which varies substantially continuously across its thickness, as is recited in each of claims 29-31 and 44. Adding Collins to show that a phosphor can be used to change light color still does not provide all of the elements of each of claims 29-31 and 44.

Since a combination of Graff and Collins does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of each of claims 29-31 and 44, these claims are patentable over Graff in view of Wolk under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graff in view of Baldo, and further in view of Wolk.

As pointed out above, Graff does not teach or suggest a coating, a composition of which varies substantially continuously across its thickness, as is recited in claim 34. Adding Baldo to show a metal reflective layer and Wolk to show an organic layer of poly(N-vinylcarbazole) still does not provide all of the elements of this claim.

Since a combination of Graff, Baldo, and Wolk does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 34, this claim is patentable over Graff in view of Baldo and Wolk under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graff in view of Baldo, and further in view of Wolk and Collins.

As pointed out above, Graff does not teach or suggest a coating, a composition of which varies substantially continuously across its thickness, as is recited in claim 35. Adding Baldo to show a metal reflective layer, Wolk to show an organic layer of poly(N-

S.N. 10/065,018

125397

vinylcarbazol), and Collins to show a phosphor still does not provide all of the elements of this claim.

Since a combination of Graff, Baldo, Wolk, and Collins does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 35, this claim is patentable over Graff in view of Baldo, Wolk, and Collins under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are patentable and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejection is requested. Allowance of claims at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Toan P. Vo, Ph.D.
Attorney for the Applicants
Registration No. 43,225
(518)387-6648

Schenectady, New York
June 5, 2004